

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 8 to 13 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 8 to 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,901,176 ("Balachandran et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Balachandran et al. do not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8, as amended, relates to an interferometric measuring system for measuring a shape deviation, position, surface properties, and vibrations of an object, including, *inter alia*, the features of a transmitting element including, a modulation interferometer, and a radiation source for short-coherent radiation, *the modulation interferometer being combined with the radiation source in a transmitter/receiver unit.*

Balachandran et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of amended claim 8. Balachandran et al. purport to relate to a fiber optic sensor system for acoustic measurements, including a light source (38), a phase modulator (36), an optical coupler (34), an optical switch (30), a sensor array (40), a photodetector (28), and a personal computer (42). The Final Office Action at page 2 refers to the light source (38) of Balachandran et al. as disclosing a radiation source for short-coherent radiation. According to Fig. 3 of Balachandran et al., however, the light source (38) is situated **outside** and separate from IOC phase modulator (36) which contains interferometer (22). In contrast, the radiation source of the present claim is **combined** with the modulation interferometer in the **same** unit, namely, the transmitter/receiver unit (Fig. 2, and page 4, lines 5 to 10). Nowhere, do Balachandran et al. disclose, or even suggest, that the modulation interferometer is combined with the radiation source in a transmitter/receiver unit.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Balachandran et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 8. Therefore, it is

respectfully submitted that Balachandran et al. do not render unpatentable the presently pending claim for at least the foregoing reasons.

As for claims 9 to 13, which depend from claim 8, and therefore include all of the features included in claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Balachandran et al. do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 9, 2009

/Clifford A. Ulrich/
By Clifford A. Ulrich (Reg. No. 42,194) for:
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)
One Broadway
KENYON & KENYON LLP
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646